



File Code: 1570 (218)
15-01-00-0080

Date: JUL 06 2015

Gary MacFarlane
Friends of the Clearwater
PO Box 9241
Moscow, ID 83843

Dear Mr. Macfarlane:

This letter is in response to your objection to the Barnyard South Sheep project located on the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. The Responsible Official, Forest Supervisor Cheryl Probert, and I as the Objection Reviewing Officer have read your objections and suggested remedies, and reviewed the Environmental Assessment (EA) and draft Decision Notice (DN) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), the project file, and the comments submitted to this project. This letter details my responses to your objections based on my review and understanding of the disclosed environmental effects of this project in accordance with 36 CFR 218, *Project Level Predecisional Administrative Review Process*.

The regulations allow for a meeting between objectors and the Reviewing Official. In my letter accepting your objection I offered to meet with you to discuss this project. Since then I have reviewed the project and your objection and had my staff review your objection, the project file, the NEPA document, and the draft decision. I did not find any points where I thought we could come to a resolution. At this time I do not feel there is enough time left in the review period to make a meeting practical. Therefore I have decided not to have a resolution meeting.

As specified at 36 CFR 218.11(b), I must provide a written response that sets forth reasons for the response; however, this written response need not be point-by-point. The Responsible Official and I have reviewed the project in light of the issues presented in your objections. I have considered your objection issues and suggested remedies. I would like to point out that the regulations require the objection must be based on previously submitted specific written comments (36 CFR 218.8(c)). I notice in your objection you bring up issues about goshawk, marten, pileated woodpecker, and fisher. I do not find were you brought up these issues in your comment letter on the Barnyard South Sheep Project.

After reviewing you objection and the project documentation, I find:

- The project incorporates design measures to minimize and/or avoid actions on high-risk landtypes, and soil resources are adequately protected.
- The analysis properly considers potential impacts to endangered species, management indicator species, and elk habitat.
- The analysis properly considers effects of sedimentation and road activities.



- The project's desired future conditions are properly described and comply with the Forest Plan.
- The cumulative effects analysis is sufficient and satisfies regulatory requirements.
- Although monitoring reports have not been completed since 2009, the Forest has continued to monitor, as required by the Forest Plan.
- The road system analysis in the EA complies with regulatory requirements and the National Environmental Policy Act.
- The project does not conflict with roadless area direction.

In conclusion, I have reviewed your assertions that the project violates various environmental laws, regulations, policies, and the Forest Plan. My review finds the project is in compliance with all applicable laws and the Forest Plan, and no additional further discussion or instruction to the Deciding Official is warranted.

My review constitutes the final administrative determination of the Department of Agriculture; no further review from any other Forest Service or Department of Agriculture official of my written response to your objection is available (36 CFR 218.11(b)(2)).

Sincerely,



DAVID E. SCHMID
Deputy Regional Forester

cc: Ray G Smith
Cheryl Probert